

AB 599 Interagency Task Force (ITF)

Cal/EPA Headquarters Building
2nd Floor, Training Room 2 West
Sacramento, CA

Meeting Summary

Thursday, July 25, 2002

ATTENDEES

ITF Members:

Al Vargas, CDFA
Gary Yamamoto, DHS
Dan Gallagher, DTSC
Carl Hauge, DWR
Lisa Babcock, SWRCB
Joe Marade, DPR

Interested Parties:

Steve Ekstrom, The Results Group
Neil Dubrovsky, USGS
Tim Parker, Groundwater Resources Assoc.
Rob Swartz, DWR
Sarah Raker, SF Bay RWQCB

James Giannopoulos, SWRCB
John Borkovich, SWRCB
Brett Wyckoff, SWRCB

Convene Meeting

- Steve Ekstrom opened the meeting at 9:40 am.

Approval of Previous ITF Meeting Summary

- The meeting summary from the July 2, 2002, ITF meeting was approved by the ITF.

Re-Cap of July 24, 2002, PAC Meeting Discussion

ITF members reviewed topics discussed at the July 24, 2002, PAC Meeting. The following is a summary of the ITF discussion:

- Add DPR Well Inventory database to statewide program diagram that Lisa B. presented at the PAC meeting (Marade)
- Shut-off time stamp on draft AB 599 Monitoring Program Report (Marade)
- James G's GeoTracker tools presentation:
 - PAC seemed to be OK with public access tiers on GeoTracker
- Statewide Monitoring Program (currently Chapter 7)
 - PAC: General format of basin by basin analyses was acceptable
 - Add list of shallow and deep groundwater basins
 - Tie together the relationship between assessments and overall statewide program
 - Define "redundancy" better in each agencies groundwater monitoring program
- List for next PAC meeting (Carl H.)
 - List of Constituents
 - Prioritize Basins
 - Map of Basins

- Include Recommendations????
- Address State Agencies Redundancies/Barriers (Keep a running List)
- Next PAC Meeting – August 28th

Action Item for ITF:

ITF agencies develop a list of redundancies/barriers and forward a list back to SWRCB by August 14.

Example: (Neil D.) Well Driller Reports – Both the DWR and DHS input well screen data separately. An efficiency would be to make the DWR database accessible electronically so the ITF agencies could share data.

Action Item for SWRCB (John B.):

Develop glossary of terms for ITF and PAC. Examples include: UST, MRL, DLR, MCLs, UCMRs, efficiencies, redundancies, streamline, CoCs, ISI, etc.

Action Item for Next PAC:

- Add supporting documentation (in writing) to support recommendation within Report to legislature.
- Steve E. will propose 2-day PAC meeting to Bill Mills.

Statewide Groundwater Monitoring Program Overview (Neil D.)

Neil D presented an overview of his progress on the statewide program:

- Low Level – Broad Spectrum
- DHS database – rich in information

To the extent possible in the given timeframe, the Report to Legislature will:

- ID priority basins
- Proposed time schedule

Action Item for ITF:

Neil needs a list from each of the ITF agencies outlining their target compounds of concern.

Resource Needs for Program

The ITF discussed means by which the funding of the program (current and on-going) could be accomplished. One means proposed was Proposition 50 on the November 2002 ballot. If Proposition 50 passes, approximately \$50M is earmarked for the SWRCB to implement the AB 599 program.

If Proposition 50 fails, then the ITF will recommend that the PAC support new legislation in the State legislature that mirrors the proposed funding under Proposition 50.

Action Item for ITF:

Construct flow chart with “conceptual model” for resource costs:

- ITF Costs
- Contract Costs

Program Implementation

The ITF discussed the prospect of implementing the AB 599 program over the next 5 years.

Discussion points included:

- Prioritizing Basins
 - Propose using example: population density and groundwater usage
 - Identifying constituents of concern
- Timeline
- Resources to Fund Program
- Unified agency products (reports)
- Public access tools

Action Item for Rob S. and Neil D.:

Create list discussing the criteria to Prioritize groundwater basins and examples of basin prioritization. *Examples:*

- Percent of the population that uses groundwater from that specific basin.
- Sole source aquifer
- Larger percentage dependence on groundwater
- Conjunctive use area

Unified Documents

James led a discussion with the ITF discussing an example of creating efficiencies/reducing redundancies (increase coordination) between the agencies as mandated by AB 599. One example of an efficiency would be to possibly create a “combined” document between the DWR’s Bulletin 118 and SWRCB’s contribution to the USEPA’s 305(b) report. This could lay the way for the overall Statewide Groundwater Quality Monitoring Report to include direct contribution from existing DWR and SWRCB reports – and vice versa.

Action Item for ITF:

Create an abstract/brief summary and outline from each report to present to the PAC on a proposed Groundwater Program Report:

- SWRCB – Abstract from 305b
- DWR - Abstract from Bulletin 118
- Create a draft agenda for next PAC meeting
 - Add synopsis as “key item”
- Each ITF agency create a list where in California groundwater monitoring has occurred

Meeting Adjourned at 3:30

*****Subsequent to the ITF meeting, the following action items were added by the ITF:**

- **Resource Needs:** Under the SWRCB lead, if Proposition 50 passes, create a BCP for all of the ITF agencies combined.
- Next ITF Meeting: Discuss what are the needs of each individual agency

- **Neil D.:** Send draft potential basin prioritization maps to SWRCB to forward to ITF for response/comment.
- **Constraints:** Add a “sidebar” to the interagency coordination section of the report to the Legislature that years ago we were not able to share info (DHS and DWR/DPR) but with the advent of the ITF/GRIST communication has allowed sharing of information.
- **ITF need:** GIS Land Use/ Pesticide Use/Local Water Agency Coverage.
- **DHS Sample Waiver Policy** (Gary Y.): waiver policy was distributed to ITF
- **Note:** The ITF also requested that the August PAC meeting be postponed to September to better prepare. Unfortunately, the PAC did not agree to change the meeting time. As a result, the ITF has slightly changed the focus for the August PAC meeting. Issues not covered in August will be addressed in following meetings.